

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Vol. VII, No. 10

JUNE 9, 1947

\$2.00 per year; 10 cents per copy

American Power and European Health

AMERICAN power is so dominant in the Western world that every problem of European destiny must wait for its solution upon some American decision. We may make a right decision on one level of policy and still wreck the European future because we fail to carry through with other necessary decisions. So far we have made one right decision; but it is not yet certain whether we will make the others.

The one right decision we have made is our evident intention to stay in Europe and prevent the Russian power from inundating the European continent. We may or may not agree with the specific policy taken in Greece and Turkey; but Europe was, on the whole, right in appreciating primarily the symbolic significance of that action. It was a symbol of our determination to remain in Europe, though there might well have been a more adequate token of this determination than what was actually done in Greece and Turkey.

It is significant however that even now Europe is still apprehensive about our future policy. It is afraid that an economic depression at home might tempt us to withdraw from our commitments. That is why Barbara Ward, the foreign editor of *The Economist*, after a recent tour of America, rightly came to the conclusion that the future of Europe will be largely determined by the health of the American economy. Here an element in human history above or below the level of conscious decision is revealed. No matter what we want to do or what we say we will do, we will not do it if we lose our power. An American depression will be, not merely a social catastrophe for us, but a calamity for the world. It may be worth noting that the Russians are speculating daily on the possibility and the imminence of this depression. Their stubbornness on many issues is partly prompted by the hope that, if they are patient enough, we will in time pull out of Europe so that they can move in.

But even if our will and our power to remain in Europe should remain unyielding, we must make another decision on a higher level of policy. We must, as Under Secretary Acheson recently insisted, offer Europe, including Great Britain, much more economic support than hitherto contemplated. Mr.

Acheson suggested a peacetime lease-lend arrangement of five billion dollars annually. Such a decision will require a very high measure of political imagination. Our treatment of Britain in the British loan negotiations does not encourage too much confidence in our ability to rise to such a level of political wisdom. The whole of western Europe is sinking in an economic morass. If there is no economic convalescence in Europe there can be no restored political health. The economic aid which is required could not be a matter of pure generosity. Nations as nations are incapable of such generosity. We could rise to such a policy only if we were wise enough to understand that generous, interest-free loans would not merely save the economy of western Europe but would also insure our own economic health. We have only begun to realize the difficulties of relating the economy of a very wealthy nation to that of a very impoverished world.

But even such economic farsightedness will not avail if we do not implement our policy by one further step. We must restore the economic health of Europe without trying to dictate the political organization of European nations. Europe seeks desperately to avoid totalitarianism; but both Britain and the continent are much too impoverished to regard our uncritical identification of free enterprise with democracy as anything but an irrelevance at best and as a peril at worst. It is not easy for a nation to exercise its power without using it to enforce its prejudices. Our excessively libertarian interpretations of democracy are a prejudice as far as Europe is concerned. If we insist upon them Europe may be wrecked even though we meet all other tests.

One final and necessary element in our policy is not so much a matter of conscious decision as of the temper and mood in which our conscious decisions are made. We cannot afford the hysteria to which those are tempted who understand the perils of our day, any more than we can afford the complacency of those who are blind to our perils. Hysterical talk about the inevitability of a third world war and the necessity of preparing for it is just as irresponsible as the policy of yielding to tyranny in order to avoid war. We are fated to live for a long while in a

world in which no stable peace can be guaranteed; but it does not follow that a war is either inevitable or desirable. We can do our duty in this kind of world only if we are as sober as we are firm. It is worth observing that the whole of modern culture, with its promise of quick and sure results for the right action has not prepared us for this kind of moral experience. This nation must draw upon the

resources of the Christian faith if we would do our duty each day without too many fearful apprehensions and too many unjustified hopes about tomorrow. "Sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof." That can only be said from the standpoint of a faith which understands the eternal depth in every moment of time, and the intrinsic meaning of every duty undertaken under God.
R. N.

Religious Liberty in Italy

HOWARD V. YERGIN

EXCEPT under the Allied Military Government of the past two years there never has been religious liberty in Italy. The martyrdom of early Christians by the dominant pagan religion of the peninsula is a tragic and glorious chapter in the story of the Christian church. Less well known, but equally tragic is the story of the persecutions through long centuries following 313, of dissenters by the dominant Christian organization. In 1173, when Peter Valdo of Lyons was converted and gathered about him an increasing number of those who were dissatisfied with the doctrines and the corruption of the Roman Catholic Church, began the definite struggle between Evangelical faith and official religion, which continues even in our day.

With the rise of this organized dissent the antagonism of the ecclesiastical authorities could not fail to manifest itself. Valdo was forbidden to preach, first by the Cardinal of Lyons, and then by the Third Lateran Council of 1179. In 1183 he and his followers, together with other groups of non-conformist Christians, were excommunicated, and there began the incessant series of crusades against dissenters. They were imprisoned, they were exiled, they were slain. They were deprived of the most elementary rights of free men. Milton's stern sonnet:

"Avenge, O Lord! thy slaughtered saints, whose bones

Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold,"

was written in horrified protest against the infamous Piedmontese Easter of 1655 when thousands of Waldensians were treacherously slain. Such as escaped died in prisons, or were publicly executed as warnings, or died on the icy mountain sides. As late as the nineteenth century these persistent evangelicals suffered under such restrictions as Prof. Luzzi describes in his "Struggle for Christian Truth in Italy". "Extraordinary taxes, demands for repayment of old debts, missions by rapacious priests, prohibition of books connected with their worship and schools, their residence in their valleys scarcely tolerated and

always more or less insecure at the will of the prince; . . . only surreptitiously a Waldensian could succeed in exercising industry or carry on commerce outside the valleys. All public posts were forbidden them, except that of Syndic; no one could be an advocate, and if anyone succeeded in becoming a doctor he could only practice the healing art among his co-religionists. Roman Catholic Churches could be multiplied ad infinitum, but not an evangelical church could be added to those already in existence."

It was not until February 17, 1848, a century ago next year, when Charles Albert of Savoy issued his Edict of Emancipation, that the Waldenses could even begin to live as full citizens and human beings. "The Waldensians are admitted to all the civil and political rights of our subjects, to attend schools and universities and to acquire academical degrees."

With the final unification of Italy in 1870, the Pope was stripped of most of his temporal possessions, only the Vatican State, a few churches and several villas were left him, although these properties were recognized as outside the Kingdom of Italy and as constituting a State in themselves. A large indemnity and an annual grant were guaranteed him. The Pope however refused to recognize the new State and shut himself up as the "Prisoner of the Vatican." Church and State continued in officially hostile relationships until 1929. The Waldenses, together with missions of evangelical churches of other lands (American Methodists, English Wesleyans, Southern Baptists, the Salvation Army, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Pentecostals, Adventists and Plymouth Brethren) were allowed considerable exercise of religious freedom as "tolerated sects". But officially and unofficially they were seriously hampered in the free exercise of their faith.

In 1929 the Pope and Mussolini signed the Lateran Pacts and the Concordat, designed to settle forever the "Roman Question". The Roman Apostolic and Catholic Church was for the first time legally recognized as the established church of Italy, and all religious and ecclesiastical privileges were conferred

upon it. Other cults were "admitted", but the restrictions upon them, though stated by indirection in the Pacts, bore striking resemblances to the restrictions listed by Luzzi, above. The Church and the State became one. Because he deemed them "contrary to public order and decency" Mussolini ruthlessly suppressed the Salvation Army and the Pentecostal groups; their property was confiscated by the State. The crucifix was placed in all school rooms; religious instruction was compulsory and was given by representatives of the Roman Church. No propaganda was permitted. New cults could be organized or new church buildings erected only when the "religious needs of the community warranted it". And these "needs" were appraised, not by the cult concerned, but by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of the area. Excommunicated or "renegade" priests could hold no position in Church or State in which he would come into contact with the public. Disturbance of a Roman Church was punished several times more severely than disturbance of an Evangelical Church or a Synagogue.

Under Allied Military Government the Lateran Pacts and Concordat, so far as they applied to non-Roman cults, became tacitly inoperative, and Evangelicals and Jews enjoyed full religious liberty as we know it in the United States; Ministers' Councils even being permitted to broadcast religious messages in a dozen cities.

On June 2, 1946, in the face of open and powerful opposition by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, Italy voted by a majority of 2,000,000 to cast off the decadent House of Savoy and become a Republic. At this election were chosen the members of the Constitutional Assembly which has been at work ever since drafting a constitution for this new Republic. The Democristiano, or Catholic party, has the largest number of delegates but not a majority; next are the Socialists, then the Communists, and then, in small numbers, representatives of nearly a score of other parties. The Communists hold the balance of power.

Following the election, the Pope at once began a campaign to have the Lateran Pacts and Concordat included in the framework of the Constitution. The Evangelical forces, united in their newly formed Federal Council of Churches of Christ of Italy, and the Jews acting with them, made able and repeated presentations to the Assembly of the need for religious liberty in a modern State. Hope was given that this might become a reality by the inclusion in the Peace Treaty between the Allies and Italy of a strong clause demanding full religious freedom. But the Pope won his point. Cynically and shrewdly the Communists threw their deciding vote in with the Democristiani, and the Pacts and the Concordat are a part of the Constitution of the Republic of Italy. True religious liberty will not exist when

Allied forces are withdrawn. A small victory has been won by liberal forces recently by the excising from Article 14 of the Constitution of an addendum to the religious liberty clause patterned after the peace treaty. This addendum stated in effect that this grant of full liberty was made "providing its exercise be not contrary to public order and decency". The fact remains that, even with the excision of this crippling clause, the religious liberty article, Section 14, is in direct conflict with Section 7, which incorporates the Lateran Pacts and Concordat. The effectiveness of the grant of religious liberty will depend upon the attitude of any enforcing officer.

And here the matter rests at present. Italy has refused to enter into the fellowship of modern states, remaining with Spain and Argentine in the religious attitudes and laws of the Dark Ages.

It is possible, just barely possible, that the Constitution may be revised and some of its clauses, including the most objectionable of the Pacts, be modified or eliminated. In fact there is so much dissatisfaction with many articles of the Constitution as at present written, that one writer in Italy predicts that the Constitution "will not have a long life". Or, if Section 7, the Pacts, remains in the Constitution, it is possible that public opinion both within and without Italy may compel a more liberal interpretation than obtained in the past under Fascism, and thereby a body of liberal precedents be built up. Our brethren in Italy again salute us, and ask our understanding sympathy and support. We may not be able to do much, but we can keep before our representatives in Senate and House and in the State Department the fact that Italy has nullified a clause of the Peace Treaty, and we can press for our Government's insistence upon fulfillment of all treaty obligations. Our Evangelical and Jewish brethren of Italy are in the front line of the struggle for tolerance and religious freedom; we cannot fail them.

Approve Formation of Hungarian Council of Churches

Formation of a Hungarian Council of Churches, modeled after similar organizations in other countries, was approved at a two-day meeting of the Synod of the Hungarian Reformed Church held at Budapest. It was announced that the Council will be set up "as soon as the International atmosphere is quieter."

The Synod adopted a resolution "to uphold spiritual brotherhood" with Hungarian Protestants "ousted and dispersed" from their homes under the terms of the Hungarian peace treaty and now being resettled in other countries, including the United States.

Gradual separation of church and state by bringing about an end to state subsidies, was approved in another resolution which called for a new system of church membership which would abolish the present custom of enrolling members at birth. (RNS)

Myth and Symbol in Religious Faith

GORDON L. FOSTER

ONE of the curious facts of our present reaction to the cold rationalism of modern science is the widespread interest in myth and symbol. Thinkers in many different areas are trying to find a way of expressing the inexpressible, of communicating the uncommunicable. The human agonies of recent years have left a realization—more acute for some than for others—that life cannot be contained in a neat physical or mathematical formula. There is a “plus” which reason alone cannot grasp and which can only be approached by the heart. The poet now pleads for “symbolic thinking”, best exemplified in the works of T. S. Eliot. The social scientist writes that “the difference between myth and scientific law is largely one of degree and emphasis.” (W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941, p. 9.) And finally, the theologian makes rich use of myth and symbol in his attempts to reformulate traditional Christian doctrine.

In other quarters the revolt against the scientific method is still more violent. The French existentialists and the new Bohemian-anarchists of the Pacific Coast both attempt to solve the dilemma of human existence in terms of feeling rather than reason.

All of this must be seen as an effort to discover again categories universal in the human race rather than a new invention of the mind of man. Toward the end of the last century, for example, Tito Vignoli wrote a book called *Myth and Science* in which he described the “mythical faculty” of the mind and placed it alongside the “scientific faculty.” In practice, he believed, both faculties are always present and complement each other. Certainly it is true that no matter what his degree of intellectual enlightenment, man has always made use of myth and symbol in his effort to relate himself to his social and physical environment. Political life, artistic life, social life and religious life have always and everywhere been enriched by their various mythical and symbolical systems.

It is, therefore, important for us to examine the meaning of myth and symbol in our lives—particularly in our religious lives. Many Americans are familiar with Reinhold Niebuhr’s analogy between the artist trying to draw a two-dimensional picture on a flat, one-dimensional canvas and the religious person trying to portray the infinite in relation to the temporal. Just as the artist must use physically deceptive symbols to give his picture perspective—and therefore psychological truth—so the religious person can only describe the eternal in terms of myth and symbol. The analogy is highly suggestive.

What is a myth? It is a symbolical representation

of truth. It is a shadow cast by the reality of truth; we do not meet truth face to face but only feel ourselves within its shadow. We are speaking here of truth in the deepest sense as that reality in which our lives are grounded and find their ultimate meaning. Myth is the device of the mind that has reached its rational limits, which has approached its inherent frontier and can push no further. The need for myth arises precisely in that moment when orderly thought and words prove inadequate to human experience. At that point the myth is an attempt to grasp the “feeling content” of life on its profoundest level. Plato, at the close of many of his discussions, finds himself confronted with some mystery which his mind cannot resolve and he regularly resorts to a myth or allegory which, while it does not spell out the hidden truth in words for all to read, nevertheless suggests what it is like.

Consider for instance what some modern theologians are calling the “myth of creation.” They do not mean that creation itself is a myth, but rather that creation can only be understood by means of myth. Popularly the term myth suggests something which is not true—a fairy-tale—and this is a great part of the difficulty with the present use of the concept. Actually, when we speak of the myth of creation we mean those imaginative terms in which it is alone possible for man to approach the mystery of his own and his world’s origin. Science has been able to push far back in its description of physical evolution but it has been no more successful than religion in describing the initial act by which something was created out of nothing. Creation in this ultimate sense is not comprehensible to human reason; only the myth can satisfy the spiritual and emotional need man feels for an explanation of his origin. The Christian myth of creation satisfies this need for it is the bearer of the spiritual truth that the world has an intelligent source.

In a somewhat different sense myth may be seen as an attempt to account for observable facts when no rational proofs are available. Thus the primitive mind imagined the sun as a flaming chariot driven daily across the sky, and we still speak of the “rising and going down of the sun.” Many of the Old Testament myths were of this nature. It should be pointed out, however, that even when greater and greater scientific knowledge is available, the myth often continues to represent fundamental truth—and hence endures among us. Insofar as the myth was founded on psychological truth and spiritual perception in the first place it continues to have validity for human experience.

The symbol is a still more essential part of religious

faith—indeed of all life, secular and religious. A symbol is a tangible object—a certain arrangement of words, or a physical thing—about which are gathered a host of emotional associations. Most of the sacramental and liturgical customs of our Christian church life are symbolical. Thus the word “cross”, or an actual physical cross, is a most potent symbol for a Christian. Not only does it call for memories based on our social experience, it also carries the mind and spirit at once beyond conventional limits. The cross is often the symbol through which the infinite is felt to impinge upon the temporal. Without such symbols we could have no religious experience. The symbol is the entrance to two-dimensional spiritual living, for it helps us to transcend our temporal limits in communion with the Eternal.

It must be admitted that such an understanding of myth and symbol is a relatively sophisticated one. For the intellectually unsophisticated mind the myth is either rejected as nonsense, or accepted as simple, literal truth. For many people it is impossible to distinguish between the *form* of a myth and the *meaning* of a myth. It is extremely difficult to center one's attention upon the reality behind the myth, upon the truth it is meant to convey, and to refuse to exalt the form in which it is cast. Thus the Biblical literalist exerts every energy to defend the six-day creation of the world as fact, while under-emphasizing the meaning of the myth: “in the beginning, God.”

Symbols also are peculiarly susceptible to corruption. A symbol is a representation of a spiritual reality. That reality never changes, but the symbols which represent it may be various. The difficulty is that each of us tends to identify *our* particular symbol with the truth it is intended to reflect. When a member of another communion uses a different symbol we often become intolerant, failing to understand that each of our symbols may reflect the same reality. Here is the psychological heart of church disunion; here is the barrier to real ecumenicity. We insist that the forms must be identical and hence prevent a meeting of hearts. We construct our symbols out of the material given us in our particular cultural experience. Members of other cultures, equally capable of spiritual perception and experiences, nevertheless clothe that experience in other symbols. Notice, for example, the difference in symbols between Western Christian churches and the so-called younger churches of the Orient. We must learn to look behind the form of the myth and the symbol to the eternal truth which they adumbrate. Only then will Christians be able to worship together in full spiritual understanding and sympathy.

A further word of warning must be given. Myth and symbol are among the most powerful motivating forces of human life, as has been convincingly shown

by Freud and Jung and the various schools of depth-analysis. We know too, what chaos develops when a segment of humanity is led to trust false myths and symbols. The German race and soil myths were in no sense true, yet they exercised a coercive, demonical power over millions of Germans for years.

Myths and symbols therefore have a double potentiality: they can assist man enormously in his effort to understand himself and God, but they can also be used by the unscrupulous to lead a people into hell. It becomes the constant task of those who reflect at all on such matters to use their highest critical faculties in this phase, as well as in all other phases of religious experience. Most of us are fully aware of the limits of our mind and that we cannot mount easily, step by logical step, from our finite bonds to God's boundlessness. For that task—the essential Christian task—myth and symbol are valuable aids, but only as long as our attention is fixed on the Truth and not on its countless refractions.

Two Encounters With Bigotry and Race Prejudice

SHERWOOD EDDY

I HAVE just returned from a three months trip, speaking in thirty-two colleges of the South, eighteen white and fourteen colored. I am always amazed and baffled at the attitude of the Solid South on the race question, though I do not find much essential difference between the North and the South. Thomas Carlyle observed that the difference between them was that the warmhearted South says to the Negro, “God bless you, be a slave;” while the cold-hearted North says, “God damn you, be free!”

With the exception of a very few, such as the members of the Fellowship of Southern Churchmen, I believe that the Solid South stands for racial segregation today as completely as it stood for slavery in 1861. And segregation is the crucial issue. Lynching is but a symptom of the deadly disease, but segregation achieves more successfully and subtly all the ends of slavery. It effectively keeps the Negro “in his place”—the place of inferiority. Segregation means, I believe, the inevitable degradation and robbery of the Negro. I believe it is the deepest denial of brotherhood to be found in the world.

When we entered at the most advanced place in the whole South, at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, there was one significant incident. Two white and two colored students who were pacifists had taken an interstate bus ticket, and were sitting side by side in the middle of the bus, not observing the rule of segregation. They got away with it in various states, but when they came to Chapel Hill, two of them were ordered out of the bus,

threatened with arrest, and the Negro was called down, struck and insulted. The Rev. Charles Jones, pastor of the Presbyterian Church, hastily took them away in his car. Because he was supposed to be at the back of this incident, and with other friends had sought to break down segregation and realize equal brotherhood, for a week a group in the town threatened his life and that of his wife, and said they would burn down his house. A dozen students slept in his home for the week to prevent the threatened burning, and Dr. Jones was advised to take his wife out of the town in this period of deep bitterness. These reactionary elements in the community will undoubtedly make a determined drive now to get him out of his church because he stands for the abolition of segregation and the realization of brotherhood. Now if this is the most advanced place in the South, it seems to me alarming and significant. It should be said that Mr. Jones had much support from the faculty and students of the University of North Carolina, and this incident is no reflection upon the policy of the University.

I may mention a second incident connected with civil liberties that occurred when I was in the South. I was asked to take the Religious Emphasis Week in the Citadel, the military college of South Carolina. General Summerall was the head of the college, formerly Chief of Staff of the American Army, before Douglas MacArthur. When I called to pay my respects to the General, I found him a bigoted and reactionary militarist. He said: "Every foot of American soil was taken by force or the threat of force, and it is held by the military force. War is the only extension of diplomacy. It is lucky that we should have General Marshall as Secretary of State, because he can at any time extend diplomacy, when it fails, into war." When I spoke of General Marshall's problems and heavy burden of responsibility, he replied: "There are no burdens and no problems unless we make them ourselves. General Marshall sees what is right. He makes his decisions based on principle, then tells the other side where to get off." (With the implication that if they do not agree, or oppose us, we have the atomic bomb and should use it in a preventive war!)

I pointed out in General Summerall's presence in the first meeting that while we could undoubtedly blow up the cities of Russia with our atomic bomb, within a few days Russia with the largest land armies in the world would take possession of the whole of continental Europe. We could not blow up Paris and kill a million Frenchmen because of the presence of a small Russian army, nor could we blow up all the other cities of Europe. We would be in for a thirty years war that no one could win. The whole of Europe would go Communist, whether by force or by persuasion, for they are masters of both.

In my series of five meetings, the first two were

on social aspects of the Gospel, and the last three were announced on personal religion, sin, and salvation. The opening meeting was a parade service with a thousand students in the Chapel. I spoke on "Building a Better World." I suggested four principles, discovered in human experience, that must be the basis of any new world or of any just and lasting peace: Justice, Brotherhood, Liberty, and Love,—the love of God and man embodied in whole religion, individual and social, that must build a new man within and a new world without.

I announced that I would speak that night on "Russia, Friend or Foe," since I had been compelled to make a brief and inadequate reference to that crucial country in the morning service. The students were very responsive, but there were two reactionary older men who attended the second meeting. One was a YMCA secretary who had married a White Russian and had served in war-torn Russia, and the other was a member of the American Legion. I pointed out that I was a loyal American, proud of my country, that I would not live in Russia for worlds because of their denial of liberty and the leaders' denial of religion in their dogmatic atheism. I mentioned the three awful purges in Russia and other sad facts. Because I said, however, that there was any good in Russia, in their aim of economic justice and of racial brotherhood, and because I mentioned any evils in America, such as our denial of justice and of racial brotherhood, this Legion man said I was preaching "straight Communism." This the students indignantly denied.

These two reactionaries went to the General the next morning and stated that I had preached straight Communism the evening before. Without giving me or any one else a hearing, and without being present at the evening meeting himself, the General posted a notice calling off all meetings, and I was fired from the campus. Many of the students were indignant, but dared not sign any petition or protest lest they suffer for it. Leaders of the Episcopal church to which the General belongs, stated that his attitude was autocratic and bigoted in the last degree, giving me many instances of his high-handed methods.

The American Legion member who made his protest to the General got his Congressman to spread on the Congressional Record my whole past record, gathered from Mrs. Dilling's *Red Network*, and like authoritative sources. Warning was given in Congress, on the radio and in the press to close colleges and churches against me as a dangerous radical.

I mentioned the above two incidents as indicative in the present tragic world situation. Yet despite the reactionary bigotry and folly of many of our leaders I am an optimist because I am a Christian. I do not expect World War III. I believe that God is still Sovereign in His heaven, though all is far from right in the world.

The World Church: News and Notes

Conference on African Affairs

Five top-ranking European experts on African affairs have recently arrived in this country to confer with American religious leaders, government officials, and educators, it was announced by Dr. Emory Ross, secretary of the Africa Committee of the Foreign Mission Conference of North America. The Foreign Missions Conference represents 123 Protestant mission boards and agencies in this country and Canada.

Described by Dr. Ross as the best informed deputation ever to visit America in regard to economic, social, medical, racial, and spiritual problems of Africa, the group consists of Col. Robert E. Van Goetham of Brussels, Army chief of Protestant chaplains in Belgium and the Belgian Congo; Canon H. Myers Grace of London, secretary of the Conference of Missionary Societies in Great Britain and Ireland; Canon Gerald W. Broomfield of London, general secretary of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa; the Rev. Joseph Ohrneman of Stockholm, general secretary of the Protestant Council in the Belgian Congo; and the Rev. Handley D. Hooper of London, African secretary of the General Missionary Society.

Primary purpose of their visit, according to Dr. Ross, will be to lay the groundwork for a closer working relationship between American and European agencies which have social, cultural, or religious interests on the African continent.

S. A. Clergy Seek to Prevent Deportations of Germans

A deputation of Dutch Reformed clergymen called on Prime Minister Jan C. Smuts in Capetown, South Africa, to plead for postponement of deportation measures against 800 Germans from Tanganyika. The Germans are in a transit camp in Southern Rhodesia.

Spokesmen for the delegation said many of the deportees had never been in Germany, but were born and reared in Tanganyika.

Among the deportees are women and children who will presumably be sent to a reception camp at Hamburg. The deportations are being made on the recommendation of police authorities who investigated Pro-Nazi activities in Tanganyika.

It was reported at a meeting of the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church in Pretoria that 4,000 pounds (\$16,000) has been collected to meet the expense of bringing German orphans to South Africa. (RNS)

Young Churchman Develops Largest Protestant Seminary in Germany

Martin Fischer, a young anti-Nazi Christian youth leader in Germany during Hitler's most successful days, has emerged in recent months as one of the most influential men in the training of young Protestant ministers for the post-war German church.

He is responsible for reorganizing a widely-known theological school here, the Kirchliche Hochschule, which is now the largest Protestant seminary in Germany, with more than 200 students.

The Hochschule, of which Fischer is director, was founded by the confessing church in 1936 after anti-Nazi churchmen like Martin Niemoeller decided that the other theological faculties had been Nazified. The Gestapo closed the school before the war, but for some years, with Fischer cooperating, it continued as a secret underground school. Frequently it changed its classes from house to house.

In recognition of his underground activities during the war, Fischer, who is in his middle thirties, was recently granted an honorary doctor's degree by the University of Tübingen—an unusual honor in Germany for so young a man. (RNS)

Alaska, Armed Fortress

The western shoreline of Alaska—at one point less than 100 miles from Russian territory—has been transformed into an armed fortress.

This disclosure was made here by Dr. Mark A. Dawber, executive secretary of the Home Missions Council of North America, who has just returned from a three-week air tour of Alaska.

While no one can be certain as to the purpose of such a transformation, Dr. Dawber told a meeting of the Council's executive committee, "everyone is suspicious and that suspicion is grounded in a growing fear of war with the U.S.S.R."

"All along the Alaskan coastline from Nome to Point Barrow," he declared, "there is evidence of military preparation. Huge concrete structures have been erected in rocky wasteland for air bases and military service."

Until this fear of war with Russia can be wiped out, Dr. Dawber warned, the picture of Alaska as a pioneer land ripe for settlement and for raising families must be heavily discounted.

Dr. Dawber severely censured Army authorities for condoning the existence in Alaska of "the most deplorable vice conditions I have seen anywhere."

"If American boys are to be sent to Alaska as part of the program for war defense," he declared, "then the American parents of these boys should rise up immediately and demand a house-cleaning. Only those who have personally observed such conditions can begin to imagine the extent of the devastation of morals and spiritual ideals that has taken place in Alaska."

Delegates from 45 Nations Registered for Oslo Conference

Delegates from 45 nations have already registered for the second World Conference of Christian Youth to be held in Oslo, Norway, July 22-31, according to conference headquarters at the World Council of Churches. Further registrations are expected to bring the number of countries represented to 50 or 60, and the total attendance to about 1,000.

In preparation for the Oslo meeting, Christian Youth groups throughout the world are now studying questions to be debated at the conference. These include the clash of freedom and social justice; world order;

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JAMES C. BAKER	JOHN A. MACKAY
JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES W. GILKEY	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
GLOSTER MORRIS, <i>Secretary of Editorial Board</i>	

church union; family relations; good and evil in modern life; and the Bible's bearing on concrete daily problems.

Two prominent American churchmen will be among speakers at the conference. They are Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, who will discuss the Christian principles basic to political, social and international problems; and Dr. Kirtley Mather, Harvard geologist and president of the national council of the YMCA in the United States, who will speak on "Science and Religion."

Other speakers will be: The Rev. D. T. Niles, Methodist youth leader from Ceylon; Miss Madeleine Barot, of Paris, head of CIMADE, French Protestant youth group, and chairman of the youth commission of the World Council of Churches; Bishop Stephen Neill, of the Church of England, recently returned from India; and Chu-Wen Li, Chinese Baptist representative on the staff of the World YMCA.

The conference will be opened by Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, general secretary of the World Council of Churches, and Bishop Eivind Berggrav, Primate of the Norwegian State Lutheran Church. The closing service will be conducted by the conference chairman, the Rev. Alex Johnson, 35-year-old Oslo pastor who was prominently identified with the Norwegian resistance movement during the war. (RNS)

Periodical Division
Detroit Public Library
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich. 650 1-45

Brown to Promote Interfaith Cooperation in Germany

Dr. Sterling W. Brown, newly-named adviser on religious affairs for the American Military Forces in Germany, announced from Berlin his chief mission will be to promote interfaith and interdenominational cooperation, and joint action among religious groups for the nation's spiritual rehabilitation.

Dr. Brown, who is on leave for two years from his post as assistant to the President of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in New York, said "our task is to encourage and help all religious elements in Germany to work fruitfully together for their common good and for the rehabilitation of their common country."

"We are not thinking of anything like unification," he added. "We simply hope to promote teamwork among the various religious elements in Germany, so that cooperation will replace strife and so that disagreements will be amicable instead of destructive." (RNS)

German Students to Study in America

Plans for bringing 25 theological students from Germany to study in America will be shared by the American Section of the Lutheran World Federation through a grant of \$12,000 voted at a recent meeting here of its Administration Committee.

The committee agreed to subsidize the studies of 15 of the theological students in the amount of \$800 each, and will also assist in placing some of them in Lutheran seminaries. The other students will be aided by Church World Service, interdenominational Protestant relief agency, in cooperation with the World Council of Churches.

India Missionaries Vow Not to Use Religion for Political Power

A pledge not to use religion "to gain political power" in India was adopted by American and other foreign missionaries of various denominations at a conference held at Kodaikanal, one of the hill stations in southern India.

"We believe in the right of the individual to outer conversion," the resolution declared, "but we have no desire to build up communal power by communal ends through conversions. We think it debasing to religion and to politics to use religious movements to gain political power."

The conference expressed "gratitude" that India's independence was secured by mutual consent between Great Britain and India and said that although "we see difficulties ahead, we believe these difficulties can be overcome." (RNS)

Authors in this Issue:

Howard V. Yergin is Executive Secretary of the Synod of New York, and recently spent 6 months in Italy as a representative of the American churches.

Gordon Foster is Pastor of Community Church, Mill Valley, California.

Sherwood Eddy is one of the sponsors of this magazine.